

DFW

Peoria, AZ
09/17/10

The Commissioner of Patents
USPTO
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313

Ref: Response to Office Action dated 09/01/10 regarding Patent
application 10/710,954.

Dear Sir,

This letter is in response to the above office action.


1. I have no clue as to why I have received a final rejection of the application as per above office action because my application is patenting a telecommunications system architecture that has not been patented as of today as per 35 USC 101 or 102. If it is based on the clauses in the above office action, I have made the necessary corrections and provided necessary responses to those clauses to refute that assertion.
2. I have removed the use of words such as "the invention", "one side", "the other side", "the PABX", "the network side", "its", "the communication". I understand that some of these words were ambiguous (invention, its, one side, other side, communication) and some referred to definitive objects in the claims (use of "the" instead of "a" or "an") which may not be appropriate. I have made the necessary corrections relating to this clause in the office action. As I have explained in "Detailed Description" the functionality of the extension box, various digital devices and PABX/EPABX are not germane to my patent application. I am not trying to patent these elements. I am trying to patent the architecture described in the application. However, I have provided some cursory functional explanation, for people familiar with the art, of the extension box or node in the "Detailed Description".
3. The examiner cites Boot (5,896,277) as a basis for rejecting (per 35 USC 102) the architecture and the claims in my application. However, on closer examination one can find that the patent 5,896,277 and my application have nothing in common. In Boot, he uses the external box as a "mediation device" (inter-working unit or IWU) to interconnect a cell based broadband network to a narrowband PABX network. The mediation device or inter-working unit (IWU) is used to convert ATM cell based signals and data to narrowband signals and data. The detailed description in Boot clearly states that the IWU converts ATM cell based broadband data and signals to PABX based narrowband data and signals. The patent specification then goes into details (via additional description and claims, figures etc.) how this is accomplished. The external box or node in my application does not do this at all. In fact, it is not a mediation device. Also, the examiner claims that Boot has incorporated the IWU into a PABX. I didn't come across

such description or claims in Boot's patent. To my knowledge, Boot does not incorporate the functionality of the IWU (mediation device) into a PABX.

4. As mentioned in the "Detailed Description" a PABX needs to be upgraded / modified to handle broadband data and signals. My patent application does not give details of what needs to be upgraded / modified in a PABX to handle broadband signals and data since that is not what I am patenting at this time. I am patenting an architecture as defined in the description and claims.
5. I do not understand the objections raised in item 4 of the office action in regards to the "dependency description" in the claims, per 37 CFR 1.75. In any case, I have removed the dependency clauses in the claims.
6. I do not agree with the examiner that there isn't sufficient description in claims, figures and detailed description (per 35 USC) that would enable anyone who is familiar with the telecommunications technology and architecture to understand "relevant art" and to fully comprehend the claimed invention. I feel that there are sufficient details in the detailed description and claims for anyone familiar with the art (technology) to understand what I am claiming to patent.
7. I have made minor changes to Figures 1, 2 and 3 to clarify some of the terminology used in detailed description and claims. As such, I am submitting new versions of these figures as "replacement sheets" per 37 CFR 1.121. The figures in the attachment replace the original figures submitted on 8/13/04 to which I currently have no access, and can not send modified versions of the original figures.
8. I have made minor changes to the "Detailed Description" of the specification and identified it as paragraph [0009] of the original specification submitted on 8/13/04. Please treat it as an addendum to the original specification. No new material has been added. The changes have been identified per 37 CFR 1.121. The original specification ended with paragraph [0008].

I have included a "Remarks Page" that provides synopsis of these changes.

Sincerely,



(Ajit G. Hemmady)